

EXHIBIT 201



Date: Thursday, September 25 2008 03:45 PM
Subject: FW: Today's call
From: Joseph Russo <Russo.4@nd.edu>
To: Nucciarone.2@nd.edu; Cannon.11@nd.edu;

Good AM:

Here is Jim's e-mail just received in advance of this afternoon's call for our 568 group.
I share it because it reflects a number of things:

How one school uses Consensus Methodology

The very close and thorough and common sense review of every decision made by Duke

The Duke policy for administering its < \$60,000 policy last year

The fact that the 568 group cannot (PAST) discuss any future institutional policy

I will really miss Jim's leadership role with this group as well as for our profession.

Joe

From: Jim Belvin [mailto:Jim.Belvin@duke.edu]
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2008 11:19 AM
To: gdeveres@cmc.edu; jim.belvin@duke.edu; joseph.a.russo.4@nd.edu; schilling@sfs.upenn.edu;
kosmond@wellesley.edu; Barkowit@mit.edu; bracken@jhu.edu; wellswt@wfu.edu; mcwade@georgetown.edu;
Kdowns@middlebury.edu; pekala@bc.edu
Subject: Today's call

Colleagues:

Thanks to Joe Russo's excellent notes I have a good sense of what was discussed after I signed off on our last call. Thanks Joe.

Today let's touch on those same issues again:

- A calculator...briefly
- Redefining the 568 Group
- A new name for the Group
- The winter workshop.

As to point issue of a new mission, it is important that we understand what our various members have done in the PAST. At Duke we use the Consensus Approach in **all** cases...no exceptions are made. Where we find a family with 568 income below \$60,000 we examine it to determine if it is a legitimate \$0 PC family. We look carefully at their assets and other circumstances to confirm that this a case in which it is appropriate to make a \$0 PC professional judgment. If it is not, then we do not assign a \$0 PC. If we assign a \$0 PC then we remove federal funds if necessary and award an all Duke package made up of

institutional loans and Duke Work Study. The university understands and has agreed to us making this final judgment regardless of our announced policy regarding low income families. We have found this to be an acceptable practice...and I suspect the type of action is not terribly different than the actions we have all traditionally taken from time to time.

What have the rest of you done in the PAST..say last spring? Let's plan on talking about this issue in detail today to see if there is any common ground.

Jim